

### **SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW**

Applicants thanks Examiner Brent Stace for being available for, and participating in, a telephonic interview that occurred on May 2, 2008, in which the Applicants' representatives discussed the differences between the claimed invention and the cited art (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,550 to Warner et al.) in support of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of independent claims 1 and 23. Specifically, Applicants' representatives brought to the attention of the Examiner that the inventive aspects of the present invention, including the aspects of the "normalization procedure" (claim 1) and operation of the "diagnostic possessor," are not taught by the Warner reference. During the discussion, the Applicants' representatives addressed the comments provided by the Examiner regarding adjustments to the suggested language of the proposed amendments. In particular, the indefinite proposed claim language of "falls short" has been addressed in the amendments provided herein.